

ISSP Study Monitoring 2002: report to the ISSP General Assembly on monitoring work undertaken for the ISSP by ZUMA, Germany

Klein, Sabine; Harkness, Janet

Veröffentlichungsversion / Published Version

Verzeichnis, Liste, Dokumentation / list

Zur Verfügung gestellt in Kooperation mit / provided in cooperation with:

GESIS - Leibniz-Institut für Sozialwissenschaften

Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Klein, S., & Harkness, J. (2004). *ISSP Study Monitoring 2002: report to the ISSP General Assembly on monitoring work undertaken for the ISSP by ZUMA, Germany*. (ZUMA-Methodenbericht, 2004/10). Mannheim: Zentrum für Umfragen, Methoden und Analysen -ZUMA-. <https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:0168-ssoar-48509-9>

Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter einer Deposit-Lizenz (Keine Weiterverbreitung - keine Bearbeitung) zur Verfügung gestellt. Gewährt wird ein nicht exklusives, nicht übertragbares, persönliches und beschränktes Recht auf Nutzung dieses Dokuments. Dieses Dokument ist ausschließlich für den persönlichen, nicht-kommerziellen Gebrauch bestimmt. Auf sämtlichen Kopien dieses Dokuments müssen alle Urheberrechtshinweise und sonstigen Hinweise auf gesetzlichen Schutz beibehalten werden. Sie dürfen dieses Dokument nicht in irgendeiner Weise abändern, noch dürfen Sie dieses Dokument für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, aufführen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Mit der Verwendung dieses Dokuments erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen an.

Terms of use:

This document is made available under Deposit Licence (No Redistribution - no modifications). We grant a non-exclusive, non-transferable, individual and limited right to using this document. This document is solely intended for your personal, non-commercial use. All of the copies of this documents must retain all copyright information and other information regarding legal protection. You are not allowed to alter this document in any way, to copy it for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the document in public, to perform, distribute or otherwise use the document in public.

By using this particular document, you accept the above-stated conditions of use.

ZUMA Methodenbericht 2004/10
ISSP Study Monitoring 2002
Report to the ISSP General Assembly
on monitoring work undertaken for the ISSP
by ZUMA, Germany
Sabine Klein and Janet Harkness

December 2004
ISSN 1610-9953

ZUMA
Quadrat B2, 1
Postfach 12 21 55
D- 68072 Mannheim

Telephone: Int+ 49+ (0) 621 1246-284,-272
Telefax: Int+ 49+ (0) 621 1246-100
E-mail: Harkness@zuma-mannheim.de
Klein@zuma-mannheim.de

Introduction

This report is based on the study monitoring survey conducted by ZUMA for the ISSP on the 2002 Family and Changing Gender Roles module.

Thirty-four member countries archived the 2002 Family and Changing Gender Roles module, all of them have completed the monitoring questionnaire. Details of the individual answers members provided are presented in the summary chart which follows here. We have done our best to summarise the answers we received and to check the information with members. Members were given the opportunity to make corrections before the report is made available on the Archive web site as a supplement to the 2002 Codebook.

The Study Monitoring Questionnaire (SMQ) has been modified from year to year. Questions on fieldwork, translation, and sampling have, for example, changed and questions on documentation been added. The latest version of the study monitoring questionnaire is appended. Some members used old versions of the SMQ they had kept. This means that some information for these countries is missing in the report. In order to avoid this in future, members are requested to contact ZUMA for the latest questionnaire in either online or word file format.

Summary of the findings

Language(s) and translation (see pages 1–6 of the Findings Chart)

From 1999 on, the SMQ asks whether members checked or evaluated their translations. All of the twenty-seven countries that produced translations checked or evaluated them (the Swiss Italian translation is an exception). Fourteen countries did not pre-test the translated questionnaire (Chile, Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Japan, Latvia, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Russia, Slovenia, Spain, and Sweden). The Philippines fielded in five languages, Switzerland in three languages and Finland, Israel, and Latvia in two languages. All the other member countries fielded in one language.

More countries reported translation problems than in the past (Chile, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Flanders, Germany, Hungary, Mexico, Norway, and Taiwan).

Survey question coverage and context (see pages 7–8 of the Findings Chart)

All countries included all of the core items. Eleven members omitted background variables, usually by mistake.

In 2002, twenty-two countries fielded the ISSP module as part of a larger survey. A new question in the SMQ asking for information about accompanying studies (topic, study title, etc.) is included in the report (see appendix).

Sampling (see pages 9–12 of the Findings Chart)

The sampling procedures and details reported for the 2002 module are for the most part similar to those reported in earlier years. Three countries seem to be using quota procedures at different stages; Brazil, the Slovak Republic, and the Netherlands. The Slovak Republic intends to change to a random sample in 2004 (for the National Identity module). Eleven reported using substitution of different kinds; Austria, Chile, Cyprus, Flanders, Hungary, Latvia, the Netherlands, the Philippines, Russia, Slovak Republic, and Spain.

Finland and Switzerland had a lower age cut-off at 15 years, Japan and the Netherlands had a cut-off at 16 years; all other members had a lower age cut-off at 18 years of age. Five countries reported an upper age cut-off (Finland at 74, Latvia at 75, Norway and Sweden at 79, and Flanders at 85 years).

Data collection (see pages 13-17 of the Findings Chart)**MODES**

Essentially the ISSP questionnaires are administered as face-to-face interviews or in a self-completion format. Five countries combined several modes in fielding, usually as a result of fielding the ISSP module together with another study and administering the background variables for both studies face-to-face and the ISSP as self-completion (Bulgaria, Germany, Flanders, Northern Ireland, and Poland).

Two countries using an interviewer-administered mode had two advance contacts, letter and telephone call (Switzerland and the United States). Nine countries had advance letters (Germany, Flanders, Great Britain, Hungary, Japan, Northern Ireland, Poland, Portugal, and Slovenia), the Netherlands had a telephone pre-contact. In Flanders interviewers delivered the questionnaire and respondents were asked to return them by post. Flanders therefore used three reminders, two by mail and one by telephone. Seven countries conducted their survey by mail (see table on page 17). Of these, Australia had six mailings, New Zealand and Norway had four, Finland and Sweden had three, Denmark and France had two mailings. The number

of mailings is usually seen as relevant for enhancing response (Dillman 2000). Sweden and Denmark had a telephone reminder. In Denmark, about 20% (256 of 1377) of the interviews were collected by telephone; the mode variable identifies these. Telephone interviews are not permitted in the ISSP.

INCENTIVES

Eight countries reported they had used incentives (Chile, Germany, Japan, the Netherlands, Northern Ireland, Norway, Taiwan and the United States). This information was not collected in the SMQ until the 2001 module.

FIELDING DATES

Dates of fielding for the 2002 module range from 2001 to 2004:

2001	1 country
2001-2002	2 countries
2002	19 countries
2001 (end) – 2003 (beginning)	1 country
2002-2003	4 countries
2003	6 countries
2003-2004	1 country

Spain had the shortest fielding period, with five days, Australia had the longest, with more than a year.

In twenty-four of twenty-seven countries using interviewer-administered modes, interviewers approached addresses or households at different times of day and at different days of the week; in two countries at different times of day only (Latvia, Spain), and in one country at different days in the week only (Slovak Republic).

Countries differ considerably in the number of required contact attempts. The minimum required number of calls at an address or a household ranges from none (Cyprus, Slovak Republic, Switzerland, and the United States) to ten (Germany). Thirteen countries supervised interviews (proportions ranging between 1%-100%). With one exception (Japan), countries using interviewer-administered modes back-checked interviews (proportions ranging between 3%-95%).

Information on response and outcome figures (see pages 18–19 of the Findings Chart)

Quota procedures, substitution, and, in some cases, a lack of sufficient detail are the three main obstacles to calculating response rates for some of the ISSP 2002 studies (cf. reasons mentioned in the Park and Jowell report (1997) and expanded in the overview of the 1996-1998 monitoring studies, Harkness, Langfeldt, and Scholz, 2001). Members also differ in their definitions of outcome codes – of what counts as “eligible“, “ineligible“, or “partially completed interviews“, and so forth. The ISSP Nonresponse methods group is currently working on standard definitions for the ISSP.

The raw figures for eligible samples and final outcomes indicate, nevertheless, that the range in the ISSP is considerable – from about 20% to over 80% for the module.

Data (see pages 20–21 of the Findings Chart)

The great majority of members employed various measures of coding reliability, for the most part logic or consistency checks and range checks, followed by either individual or automatic corrections or both.

Sixteen of thirty-four countries applied subsequent weights or post-stratification to correct for errors of selection or response bias.

Documentation (see page 22 of the Findings Chart)

Nineteen countries reported they had a national methods report available (Australia, Austria, Brazil, Chile, Czech Republic, Germany, Spain, Flanders, Great Britain, Hungary, Norway, Northern Ireland, Poland, Russia, Taiwan, the Philippines, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, and the United States). This information was not collected in the SMQ until the 2001 module.

References

Dillman, D.A. (2000): Mail and Internet Surveys. The Tailored Design Method. 2. Edition. New York: Wiley.

Harkness, J., Langfeldt, B. and Scholz, E. (2001): ISSP Study Monitoring 1996-1998, Reports to the ISSP General Assembly on monitoring work undertaken for the ISSP by ZUMA, Germany, Mai 2001. (available online with the 1996-1998 codebooks)

Park, A. and Jowell, R. (1997): Consistencies and differences in a cross-national survey. The International Social Survey Programme (1995). (available online with the 1995 codebook)

Chart of Archive and Report Delivery 1996–2002¹
 (based on Central Archive and ZUMA documentation, May, 2004: Australia to Denmark)

Country (member since)	Module	Archived	Study Report	Country (member since)	Module	Archived	Study Report
Australia (1984)	1996	✓	No	Canada (1991)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	No			1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓		1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓		1999	✓	✓
	2000	No			2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓		2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓		2002	No	
Austria (1985)	1996	No	No	Chile (1997)	1996		
	1997	✓	✓		1997		
	1998	✓	✓		1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓		1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓		2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓		2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓		2002	✓	✓
Bangladesh (1997) - (2003)	1996		No	Cyprus (1995)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓			1997	✓	✓
	1998	No			1998	✓	No
	1999	No			1999	✓	✓
	2000	(TP)	No		2000	No	
	2001	No			2001	✓	✓
	2002	No			2002	✓	✓
Brazil (1999)	1996			Czech Republic (1991)	1996	✓	✓
	1997				1997	✓	✓
	1998	(TP)	(✓)		1998	✓	✓
	1999	(TP)	(✓)		1999	✓	✓
	2000	No			2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓		2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓		2002	✓	✓
Bulgaria (1991)	1996	✓	✓	Denmark (1998)	1996		
	1997	✓	✓		1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓		1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓		1999	(TP)	(✓)
	2000	✓	✓		2000	✓	✓
	2001	No			2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓		2002	✓	✓

TP: Data not archived as part of merged ISSP data set because of technical problems with sampling, fielding, or late archiving.

¹ South Korea, Uruguay and Venezuela are not included in this table because they have not archived their data yet. Venezuela joined the ISSP in 1999; South Korea and Uruguay in 2003.

Chart of Archive and Report Delivery 1996–2002¹
(based on Central Archive and ZUMA documentation, May, 2004: Finland to Japan)

Country (member since)	Module	Archived	Study Report	Country (member since)	Module	Archived	Study Report
Finland (2000)	1996			Hungary (1986)	1996	✓	✓
	1997				1997	✓	✓
	1998				1998	✓	✓
	1999				1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓		2000	No	
	2001	✓	✓		2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓		2002	✓	✓
Flanders (2000)	1996			Ireland (1986)	1996	✓	✓
	1997				1997	(TP)	(✓)
	1998				1998	✓	
	1999				1999	(TP)	(✓)
	2000				2000	✓	✓
	2001				2001	No	
	2002	✓	✓		2002	✓	✓
France (1995)	1996	✓	✓	Israel (1988)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓		1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓		1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓		1999	✓	✓
	2000	No			2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓		2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓		2002	✓	✓
Germany (1984)	1996	✓	✓	Italy (2001, re- instated)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓		1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓		1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓		1999	(No)	
	2000	✓	✓		2000	(No)	
	2001	✓	✓		2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓		2002	No	
Great Britain & Northern Ireland (1984)	1996	✓	✓	Japan (1991)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓		1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓		1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓		1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓		2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓		2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓		2002	✓	✓

TP: Data not archived as part of merged ISSP data set because of technical problems with sampling, fielding, or late archiving.

¹ South Korea, Uruguay and Venezuela are not included in this table because they have not archived their data yet. Venezuela joined the ISSP in 1999; South Korea and Uruguay in 2003.

Chart of Archive and Report Delivery 1996–2002¹
 (based on Central Archive and ZUMA documentation, May, 2004: Latvia to Slovak Republic)

Country (member since)	Module	Archived	Study Report	Country (member since)	Module	Archived	Study Report
Latvia (1997)	1996	✓	✓	Philippines (1989)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	No			1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓		1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓		1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓		2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓		2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓		2002	✓	✓
Mexico (2000)	1996			Poland (1992)	1996	✓	✓
	1997				1997	✓	✓
	1998				1998	✓	✓
	1999				1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓		2000	No	
	2001	No			2001	✓	✓
Netherlands (1985)	2002	✓	✓		2002	✓	✓
	1996	No		Portugal (1995)	1996	No	
	1997	✓	✓		1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓		1998	✓	✓
	1999	(TP)	(✓)		1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓		2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓		2001	No	
	2002	✓	✓		2002	✓	✓
New Zealand (1990)	1996	✓	✓	Russia (1990)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓		1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓		1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓		1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓		2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓		2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓		2002	✓	✓
Norway (1988)	1996	✓	✓	Slovak Republic (1996, re- instated)	1996	No	
	1997	✓	✓		1997	No	
	1998	✓	✓		1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓		1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓		2000	No	
	2001	✓	✓		2001	No	
	2002	✓	✓		2002	✓	✓

TP: Data not archived as part of merged ISSP data set because of technical problems with sampling, fielding, or late archiving.

¹ South Korea, Uruguay and Venezuela are not included in this table because they have not archived their data yet. Venezuela joined the ISSP in 1999; South Korea and Uruguay in 2003.

Chart of Archive and Report Delivery 1996–2002¹
 (based on Central Archive and ZUMA documentation, May, 2004: Slovenia to USA)

Country (member since)	Module	Archived	Study Report
Slovenia (1992)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓
South Africa (2001, re-instituted)	1996		
	1997		
	1998		
	1999		
	2000		
	2001	✓	✓
	2002	No	
Spain (1993)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓
Sweden (1992)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓
	2001	No	
	2002	✓	✓

Country (member since)	Module	Archived	Study Report
Switzerland (1999)	1996		
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	No
	1999	(TP)	(✓)
	2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓
Taiwan (2001)	1996		
	1997		
	1998		
	1999		
	2000		
	2001		
	2002	✓	✓
USA (1984)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓

TP: Data not archived as part of merged ISSP data set because of technical problems with sampling, fielding, or late archiving.

¹ South Korea, Uruguay and Venezuela are not included in this table because they have not archived their data yet. Venezuela joined the ISSP in 1999; South Korea and Uruguay in 2003.

Monitoring Findings Chart
2002
for

Austria (A)
Australia (AUS)
Bulgaria (BG)
Brazil (BR)
Switzerland (CH)
Chile (CL)
Cyprus (CY)
Czech Republic (CZ)
Germany (D)
Denmark (DK)
Spain (E)
France (F)
Finland (FIN)
Flanders (FL)
Great Britain (GB)
Hungary (H)
Israel (IL)
Ireland (IRL)
Japan (J)
Latvia (LV)
Mexico (MEX)
Norway (N)
Northern Ireland (NIR)
Netherlands (NL)
New Zealand (NZ)
Portugal (P)
Poland (PL)
The Philippines (RP)
Russia (RUS)
Sweden (S)
Slovak Republic (SK)
Slovenia (SLO)
Taiwan (TW)
United States of America (USA)

Language(s) and translation

	A	AUS	BG	BR	CH	CL	CY	CZ	D	DK	E	F	FIN	FL	GB	H	IL
<i>Language(s) of the fielded module</i>																	
Language 1 (L1)	German	English	Bulgarian	Portuguese	German French Italian	Spain	Greek	Czech	German	Danish	Spanish	France	Finnish Swedish	Dutch	English	Hungary	Hebrew Arab
Language 2 (L2)																	
Language 3 (L3)																	
<i>Was the questionnaire translated?</i>																	
Yes, translated:	X ^A																
- by member(s) of research team			X		L1, L2		X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	
- by translation bureau						X								X			
- by specially trained translator(s)				X	L3				X				X				X
No, not translated		X													X		

^A Austria used the German (ZUMA) translation.

Translation (continued)

	IRL	J	LV	MEX	N	NIR	NL	NZ	P	PL	RP	RUS	S	SK	TW	SLO	USA
<i>Language(s) of the fielded module</i>																	
Language 1 (L1)	English	Japanese	Latvian	Spanish	Norwegian	English	Dutch	English	Portuguese	Poland	Tagalog	Russian	Swedish	Slovak	Mandarin	Slovenian	English
Language 2 (L2)			Russian								Ilocano						
Language 3 (L3)											Bicolano						
Language 4 (L4)											Cebuano						
Language 5 (L5)											Ilonggo						
<i>Was the questionnaire translated?</i>																	
Yes, translated:																	
- by member(s) of research team		X	X		X		X		X	X	L1		X	X		X	
- by translation bureau		X															
- by specially trained translator(s)				X						X		X	X		X		
- other											L1-5						
No, not translated	X					X		X									X

Translation (continued)

	A	AUS	BG	BR	CH	CL	CY	CZ	D	DK	E	F	FIN	FL	GB	H	IL
<i>Language(s) of the fielded module</i>																	
Language 1 (L1)	German	English	Bulgarian	Portuguese	German	Spain	Greek	Czech	German	Danish	Spanish	France	Finnish	Dutch	English	Hungary	Hebrew
Language 2 (L2)					French								Swedish				Arab
Language 3 (L3)					Italian												
<i>Was the translated questionnaire assessed/checked or evaluated?</i>																	
Yes:																	
- group discussion			X	X	L1, L2	X	X	X	X			X	X				X
- expert checked it			X						X		X	X	X	X		X	
- other										X							
No					L3												
Not applicable	(X) ^A	X													X		

^A Austria used the German (ZUMA) translation.

Translation (continued)

	IRL	J	LV	MEX	N	NIR	NL	NZ	P	PL	RP	RUS	S	SK	SLO	TW	USA
<i>Language(s) of the fielded module</i>																	
Language 1 (L1)	English	Japanese	Latvian	Spanish	Norwegian	English	Dutch	English	Portuguese	Poland	Tagalog	Russian	Swedish	Slovak	Slovenian	Mandarin	English
Language 2 (L2)			Russian								Ilocano						
Language 3 (L3)											Bicolano						
Language 4 (L4)											Cebuano						
Language 5 (L5)											Ilonggo						
<i>Was the translated questionnaire assessed/checked or evaluated?</i>																	
Yes:																	
- group discussion			X		X				X	X	L1, L2, L3, L4		X	X	X	X	
- expert checked it										X		X		X			
- back translation				X							L1-5						
- other		X					X										
Not applicable	X					X		X									X

Translation (continued)

	A	AUS	BG	BR	CH	CL	CY	CZ	D	DK	E	F	FIN	FL	GB	H	IL
<i>Language(s) of the fielded module</i>																	
Language 1 (L1)	German	English	Bulgarian	Portu- guese	German French Italian	Spain	Greek	Czech	German	Danish	Spanish	France	Finnish Swedish	Dutch	English	Hungary	Hebrew Arab
Language 2 (L2)																	
Language 3 (L3)																	
<i>Was the questionnaire pre-tested?</i>																	
Yes			X	X	X		X		X				X	X		X	X
No						X		X		X	X	X					
Not applicable	(X) ^A	X													X		
<i>Were there any questions... which caused problems when translating?</i>																	
Yes																	
No			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X
Not applicable	(X) ^A	X													X		

^A Austria used the German (ZUMA) translation.

Translation (continued)

	IRL	J	LV	MEX	N	NIR	NL	NZ	P	PL	RP	RUS	S	SK	SLO	TW	USA
<i>Language(s) of the fielded module</i>																	
Language 1 (L1)	English	Japanese	Latvian	Spanish	Norwegian	English	Dutch	English	Portuguese	Poland	Tagalog	Russian	Swedish	Slovak	Slovenian	Mandarin	English
Language 2 (L2)			Russian								Ilocano						
Language 3 (L3)											Bicolano						
Language 4 (L4)											Cebuano						
Language 5 (L5)											Ilonggo						
<i>Was the questionnaire pre-tested?</i>																	
Yes				X							X			X		X	
No		X	X		X		X		X	X		X	X		X		
Not applicable	X					X		X									X
<i>Were there any questions... which caused problems when translating?</i>																	
Yes				X	X											X	
No		X	X				X		X		X	X	X	X	X		
Not applicable	X					X		X		X							X

Survey context

	A	AUS	BG	BR	CH	CL	CY	CZ	D	DK	E	F	FIN	FL	GB	H	IL	IRL	J	LV	MEX	N	NIR	NL	NZ	P	PL	RP	RUS	S	SK	SLO	TW	USA
<i>How was the ISSP module fielded?</i>																																		
Individual survey:				X			X	X		X	X	X	X				X		X		X									X				
Larger survey:																																		
- with ISSP at start																																		
- with ISSP in middle																																		
- with ISSP at end	X								X					X									X					X						X

Question coverage and order

	A	AUS	BG	BR	CH	CL	CY	CZ	D	DK	E	F	FIN	FL	GB	H	IL	IRL	J	LV	MEX	N	NIR	NL	NZ	P	PL	RP	RUS	S	SK	SLO	TW	USA
<i>Were the ISSP questions asked in prescribed order?</i>																																		
Yes	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
No		X																																
<i>Were all the core ISSP items included?</i>																																		
Yes, all included		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
No, not all included:																																		
- background items	X							X	X		X			X					X						X		X					X		

Sampling

	A	AUS	BG	BR	CH	CL	CY	CZ	D	DK	E	F	FIN	FL	GB	H	IL	IRL	J	LV	MEX	N	NIR	NL	NZ	P	PL	RP	RUS	S	SK	SLO	TW	USA
<i>The sample was designed to be representative of...</i>																																		
...only adult citizens of country	X	X				X	X	X	X		X		X		X		X		X	X				X					X					
...adults of any nationality			X	X	X			X		X		X				X		X			X	X	X		X					X				X
<i>Was your sample designed to be representative of adults living in...</i>																																		
...private accommodation only	X			X	X	X	X	X	X		X				X		X		X		X			X			X						X	
...private & institutional accommodation		X								X			X							X														
Question not asked																															X			
<i>Lower age cut-off</i>																																		
18	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X		X		X		X		X		X		X		X	
16																				X														
15					X								X							X														

Sampling (continued)

	A	AUS	BG	BR	CH	CL	CY	CZ	D	DK	E	F	FIN	FL	GB	H	IL	IRL	J	LV	MEX	N	NIR	NL	NZ	P	PL	RP	RUS	S	SK	SLO	TW	USA
Was there an upper age cut-off?																																		
	Yes												74	85							75	79							79					
	No	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Did you use any variables for stratification?																																		
	Yes																																	
	No	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X		X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
How many stages does your sampling design have?																																		
	One stage		X							X			X									X			X				X					
	Two stages			X			X		X			X		X					X				X			X				X				
	Three stages				X	X		X							X	X	X	X		X ^{RP}	X												X	
	Four or more stages	X																										X ^{RP}						
Question not asked																										X								

^{RP} The Philippines used two different sampling methods; see Study Description Sheet for information.

Sampling (continued)

	A	AUS	BG	BR	CH	CL	CY	CZ	D	DK	E	F	FIN	FL	GB	H	IL	IRL	J	LV	MEX	N	NIR	NL	NZ	P	PL	RP	RUS	S	SK	SLO	TW	USA	
Does your sampling frame consist of...																																			
Addresses			X									X			X			X		X			X				X							X	
Households				X			X																												
Named individuals (target persons)	X	X							X	X			X			X			X			X								X		X			
Areas											X						X																		
Something else						X																													
What selection method was used to identify a respondent?																																			
Kish grid	X		X		X	X	X	X			X				X		X					X					X							X	
Birthday method												X						X		X				X		X			X						
Quota				X																				X											
Not applicable		X							X	X			X																		X		X		

Sampling (continued)

	A	AUS	BG	BR	CH	CL	CY	CZ	D	DK	E	F	FIN	FL	GB	H	IL	IRL	J	LV	MEX	N	NIR	NL	NZ	P	PL	RP	RUS	S	SK	SLO	TW	USA
<i>Was substitution of individuals permitted at any stage of selection process or during fieldwork?</i>																																		
Yes	X ^{1,2}					X ^{1,2}	X ²				X ^{1,2}			X ^{1,2}		X ²				X ²			X ^{1,2}					X ^{1,2,3}	X ^{1,2}	X ¹				
No		X	X	X	X			X	X	X		X	X		X		X	X	X	X		X	X		X	X	X	X				X	X	X

¹ Substitution of refusals

² Substitution of non-contacts, people away during survey period, etc.

³ Substitution of sample points

Data collection

	A	AUS	BG	BR	CH	CL	CY	CZ	D	DK	E	F	FIN	FL	GB	H	IL	IRL	J	LV	MEX	N	NIR	NL	NZ	P	PL	RP	RUS	S	SK	SLO	TW	USA	
<i>Data collection methods used (substantive & background)?</i>																																			
Face-to-face	X		X ^{s,b}	X	X	X	X	X	X ^b		X			X ^b		X	X	X	X	X	X		X ^b			X	X ^{s,b}	X				X			
Self-Completion (with interviewer involvement)			X ^{s,b}						X ^s					X ^s	X								X ^s	X			X ^s								
Self-completion by mail	X									X ^{s,b}		X	X											X											
Telephone										X ^{s,b}																									
<i>Length of fieldwork</i>																																			
2 weeks or less				X							X					X				X		X													
Over 2 wks < 1 month						X		X												X	X					X									
1 month < 2 mths	X		X				X						X									X													
2 months < 3 mths																		X				X													
3 mths or more		X			X				X	X		X		X	X									X										X	
<i>Year of fieldwork</i>																																			
2001		X	X															X						X										X	
2002		X			X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
2003	X	X		X	X					X	X		X								X		X										X		
2004	X			X	X								X								X														

^s substantive variables

^b background variables

Data collection: face-to-face and self-administered with some interviewer involvement

	A	BG	BR	CH	CL	CY	CZ	D	E	FL	GB	H	IL	IRL	J	LV	MEX	NIR	NL	P	PL	RP	RUS	SK	SLO	TW	USA
Were postal or telephone components used?																											
				X				X		X	X	X			X			X		X	X			X		X	
										X																	
				X						X									X							X	
- reminder & thank you letters										X																	
				X						X									X								
										X																	
										X																X	
Yes - telephone components										X																	
	X	X	X		X	X	X		X				X	X		X	X					X	X		X		
Were incentives offered?																											
Question not asked																											
Were interviewers paid according to realized cases?																											
Yes	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X		X	X ^{SK}	X		
					X																					X	
No																											

^{SK} Interviewers paid per day and per performance.

Data collection: face-to-face and self-administered with some interviewer involvement (continued)

	A	BG	BR	CH	CL	CY	CZ	D	E	FL	GB	H	IL	IRL	J	LV	MEX	NIR	NL	P	PL	RP	RUS	SK	SLO	TW	USA
Which of these rules governed how an interviewer approached an address or household?																											
Call at different time of day	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Call on different days in week	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Were a minimum number of calls required?																											
Yes:																											
Minimum number of required calls	5	3	3		3		5	10	3	4	4	3	3	5	3	2	3	3	3	4	3	2	4		5	3	
No				X		X																	X			X	
Were any interviews supervised?																											
Yes:																											
Approximate proportion (%)		7	20		28	20	3		X		14						25			1		10		4		100	
No	X			X				X		X		X	X	X	X	X		X	X		X		X		X		

Data collection: face-to-face and self-administered with some interviewer involvement (continued)

	A	BG	BR	CH	CL	CY	CZ	D	E	FL	GB	H	IL	IRL	J	LV	MEX	NIR	NL	P	PL	RP	RUS	SK	SLO	TW	USA
Were any interviews back-checked?																											
Yes:																											
Approximate proportion (%)	15	3	20	20	16	10	30	95	10	60	10	25	15	10		10	5	10	10	20	10	30	20	4	60	30	20
No															X												

Data collection: mail

	AUS	DK	F	FIN	N	NZ	S
<i>Were any contacts made by telephone or interviewer?</i>							
Yes:							
- reminders by telephone		X ^{DK}					X ^S
No	X		X	X	X	X	
<i>What was sent out in the first mailing?</i>							
Questionnaire	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Data protection information	X	X	X	X	X		X
Explanatory letter	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Incentive					X		
Other material	X					X	
<i>What was sent out in the second mailing?</i>							
Thank you and reminder combined	X		X	X	X		X
Reminder sent only to non-respondents		X				X	
Questionnaire			X			X	
Data protection information			X				
Explanatory letter			X				
Other material							X

^{DK, S} Denmark and Sweden used a telephone reminder after last mailing

	AUS	DK	F	FIN	N	NZ	S
<i>What was sent out in the third mailing?</i>							
Questionnaire	X			X	X	X	X
Data protection information	X			X	X		X
Explanatory letter	X			X	X	X	X
Other material	X						
No third mailing		X	X				
<i>What was sent out in the fourth (or last) mailing?</i>							
Questionnaire					X	X	
Data protection information					X		
Explanatory letter	X				X	X	
Reminder only to non-respondents							
No fourth mailing		X	X	X			X

Information on response and outcome figures

	A	AUS	BG	BR	CH	CL	CY	CZ	D ^p	DK	E	F	FIN	FL	GB	H	IL
<i>Response figures based on reported figures</i>																	
Issued sample (n)	3400	2981	1200		3280	1505	1400	2298	2277/ 1043	2100	2500	10000	2498	2125	4133	1728	3610
Ineligible (n)	197	623	47		210	9		64	79/36	18	8	403	10	61	375	104	109
Eligible (n)	3203	2358	1153		3070	1496	1400	2234	2198/ 1007	2082	2492	9597	2488	2064	3758	1624	3501
- refusal (n)	515	159	56		1485	131	151	489	642/301	374	10		15	386	967	264	1396
- non-contact (n)	641	684	49		215	75	245	220	80/58		5	7621	1111	102	178	211	451
- other unproductive (n)		111	45		331	16		236	526/221	329	6		9	216	301	126	445
- completed cases (n)	2047	1352	1003	2000	1008	1505/1274 _{CL}	1004	1289	936/431	1377 ^{DK}	2471	1951	1353	1360	2304	1023	1209
- partially completed (n)		52			31				14/0	2		25			8		

^{CL} First count includes substituted interviews.

^D Western federal states followed by eastern federal states.

^{DK} 256 telephone interviews included.

Information on response and outcome figures (continued)

	IRL	J	LV	MEX	N	NIR	NL	NZ	P	PL	RP	RUS	S	SK	SLO	TW	USA
<i>Response figures based on reported figures</i>																	
Issued sample (n)	2224	1800	1805	1812	2500	2973	5050	2075	2154	2004		5645	2000		1612	3735	2463
Ineligible (n)	127	118	96	6	50	80		298	174	143		169	111		102	78	387
Eligible (n)	2097	1682	1709	1806	2450	2893	5050	1777	1980	1861		5476	1889		1510	3657	2076
- refusal (n)	490	253	285	152	111	688	2450	60	501	354	363	2373	187	202	204	428	700
- non-contact (n)		141	377	50	815	405	1347	626	375	146	850	1089	517		101	396	40
- other unproductive (n)	351	156	47		49		151	66		109	177	187	105		112	850	165
- completed cases (n)	1241	1132	994	1496	1475	1800	1249/1102 _{NL}	1025	1094	1252	1200	1798	1080	1133	1092	1983	1171
- partially completed (n)	15		6	108					10			29			1		

^{NL} First figure includes 147 questionnaires completed by a second household member (two questionnaires in one household).

Data

	A	AUS	BG	BR	CH	CL	CY	CZ	D	DK	E	F	FIN	FL	GB	H	IL	IRL	J	LV	MEX	N	NIR	NL	NZ	P	PL	RP	RUS	S	SK	SLO	TW	US
Were any measures of coding reliability employed?																																		
Yes	X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X		X	X		X	X	X		X	
No				X	X									X					X	X					X							X		
Was the keying of the data verified?																																		
Yes:																																		
Approximate proportion (%)					100	100	10	100	100		100		1	100	100	100	15		100		95	20				100			100	10			100	
No	X	X	X	X						X		X						X		X	X		X	X	X	X	X		X	X		X	X	
Not answered																														X				
Were any reliability checks made on derived variables?																																		
Yes		X	X	X		X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
No	X				X					X					X		X		X	X											X			
Not applicable																													X					

Data (continued)

	A	AUS	BG	BR	CH	CL	CY	CZ	D	DK	E	F	FIN	FL	GB	H	IL	IRL	J	LV	MEX	N	NIR	NL	NZ	P	PL	RP	RUS	S	SK	SLO	TW	USA
<i>Data checks/edits on:</i>																																		
- filters	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
- logic or consistency	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X			X	X	
- ranges	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
<i>Were data errors corrected?</i>																																		
Yes:																																		
- individually	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
- automatically	X	X	X									X				X	X			X					X	X								
No				X																				X										
Not answered																								X										
<i>Were the data weighted or post-stratified?</i>																																		
Yes	X		X		X	X		X				X	X	X	X	X		X								X	X							
No		X		X			X		X	X	X						X	X		X	X													X

Documentation

	A	AUS	BG	BR	CH	CL	CY	CZ	D	DK	E	F	FIN	FL	GB	H	IL	IRL	J	LV	MEX	N	NIR	NL	NZ	P	PL	RP	RUS	S	SK	SLO	TW	USA
<i>Is a national methods report available for your study?</i>																																		
Yes	X	X		X	X	X		X	X		X			X	X	X						X					X		X			X		X
No							X			X		X	X						X		X													
Question not asked			X														X	X						X		X					X			

Appendix

Please provide information about the other study(ies) the ISSP was fielded with (e.g., topic, survey name).		
1	Austria	"Social Change in Austria"
2	Australia	na
3	Switzerland	The ISSP was fielded together with the "Eurobarometer in Switzerland (EBCH)". The topic of the EBCH of 2002 was Biotechnology which corresponds to the EB58.0 of the European Union.
4	Bulgaria	na
5	Chile	The ISSP study was part of the second National Public Opinion Study 2002 about politics, economy and corruption.
6	Germany	ISSP is part of the ALLBUS (German General Social Survey). The ALLBUS 2002 deals with various topics, such as religiosity, values and value orientations.
7	Flanders	Survey on Social-Cultural Changes in Flanders including the standard background variables
8	Great Britain	British Social Attitudes Survey, 2002
9	Hungary	The ISSP Family and Gender Roles module was placed in the beginning of the questionnaire, just after the questions on gender and year of birth. The whole module was asked in one block. It was followed by some other questions on family issues. Subsequent blocks related to 1. opinions about the Euro and the Hungarian currency 2. schooling problems of children coming from low class and gypsy population.
10	Ireland	The Family and Changing Gender Roles module was included as part of a larger survey addressing general social and political attitudes in Ireland.
11	Latvia	ISSP module was fielded together with ISSP module "National Identity" (topic B) and these were followed by questions on medical care.
12	Norway	1. Grandparents' role 2. Relationship parents-children 3. the ESRC project 'Employment and the Family'
13	Northern Ireland	Northern Ireland Life and Times Survey (NILT, 2002). Other topics included in the survey were Women in Politics, Attitudes/knowledge of the European Union, Political Attitudes, Community Relations, Rights of the Child.
14	Netherlands	Cultural Changes Survey 2002; ISSP module on Social Networks

Please provide information about the other study(ies) the ISSP was fielded with (e.g., topic, survey name).		
15	New Zealand	Some additional questions on the roles of men and women in society, and attitudes to abortion and euthanasia, were added after the ISSP module.
16	Portugal	na
17	Poland	Polish General Social Survey (PGSS)
18	The Philippines	Quality of life indicators, electoral preferences for May 2004, attributes of candidates, trust rating of selected personalities and political parties, domestic violence, polling on polls, media credibility, awareness of tuberculosis, most admired men and women.
19	Russia	General social and political problems of the Russian society
20	Slovenia	ISSP module National Identity - national survey Attitudes on Local Democracy
21	Taiwan	Taiwan Social Change Survey: the Third Survey of the Fourth Cycle. In addition to core ISSP questions, the themes related to gendered body-consciousness, attitudes toward sexuality, women in civil participation, and couple's marital satisfaction and lives.
22	USA	2002 General Social Survey